

S.N. 10/604,870
Office Action 08/26/05
Amendment Dated 11/28/05

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his consideration of this case.

Claims 1-29 are in this case. The examiner has rejected Claims 1-12 and 14-29. The Examiner states that claim 13 is directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 20, 24, and 27 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Applicants however contend that such claim amendments are not made or needed to distinguish the cited art of record.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting the telephone interview on November 3, 2005, for which an Examiner's Interview Summary has been issued. The Examiner agreed to withdraw his present grounds of rejection. The Applicants' arguments in that telephone interview are reiterated and detailed below.

A. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being Obvious over Martin (US 4,280,185A) in view of Muehl et al. (US20040024501A1)

The Applicants note that there is the potential for confusion between the application and the two references cited (Martin and Muehl et al.). This arises from differences in language as used in the three different documents. To clarify this confusion in terms, the Applicants submit the following chart which shows how terminology is used among the present application (Joshi), Martin, and Muehl.

Element Complexity	Joshi	Martin	Muehl
Aircraft		No mention	"Complex Article"
Engine	"Engine"	"Engine"	"Component"
Engine Component	"Component"	"Module "	"Component"
Individual Part	"Part"	No mention	No mention

In the above chart the left hand column shows the level of complexity of the various elements of an aircraft and/or engine that are discussed in the Joshi application, Martin, and

S.N. 10/604,870
Office Action 08/26/05
Ameadment Dated 11/28/05

Muehl. The other three columns show the terminology used by Joshi, Martin and Muehl to refer to the corresponding element. The Examiner's attention is drawn to the bottom row of the chart. There it is seen that neither Martin nor Muehl mention a part of a component.

Martin is directed at one apparatus for the whole engine which monitors its performance (see Martin, FIG. 1). The modules in Martin are tracked in their entirety. That is, each module is tracked as a unit. Martin neither suggests nor makes an attempt to track the individual parts that comprise the module.

Further, Martin addresses only monitoring and maintaining records on whole modules. He does not address individual parts. For example, at column 4, lines 37-42, as cited by the Examiner, Martin only addresses life history and engine configuration of entire modules comprising the engine.

Muehl in paragraph [0003] defines the word component, and as seen in the chart above, a "component" of Muehl is equivalent to a "module" of Martin and to a "component" of the Joshi application. Though Muehl mentions in paragraph [0056] that a component can be a part of another component, Muehl does not mention parts of such components.

In summary, both Martin and Muehl address taking data on component systems such as an engine, compressor, etc. Neither discloses or suggests studying individual parts of the components or the collection of data on individual parts of such components.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of the Claims 1-12 and 14-29.

Further, the Applicants make particular note of Claims 8, 9, 21 and 29.

In Claims 8 and 21 the entire history of individual parts comprising a component is made a permanent part of the component and the stored information about the individual parts that comprise that component remains with the engine component for the life of the component. Martin makes no mention of recording any data regarding operation, maintenance or repair of individual parts nor does he seek to keep part data with the component for the life of the component. Instead, he is concerned with component operating and configuration parameters, never even seeking to look at or understand individual parts.

In Claims 9 and 29 the Joshi application makes the information storage device an actual part of each component of the engine so that the information recorded thereon is permanent and remains with the component throughout its lifetime. In contrast, Martin makes no mention of

S.N. 10/604,870
Office Action 08/26/05
Amendment Dated 11/28/05

storing information physically on each component itself but, rather, says that data on engine component configuration and operating parameters can be stored somewhere on the engine or off the engine entirely (column 3, lines 45-50). Further, as the Examiner has cited, Martin (column 8, lines 17-21) stores only information concerning the module (or component, please see the above chart) as a whole. Martin only concerns himself with storing information on overall engine configuration and operation. According to Martin, the configuration information may not even be stored with the engine at all.

Because of these arguments, the Applicants contend that all the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of the rejected claims as amended in view of the foregoing remarks.

B. Response to Rejection of Claims 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) As Being Obvious over Martin in View of Vogan et al. (US 5,968,107A)

Regarding claims 11 and 18, the Examiner has rejected Claims 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Vogan et al. (US 5,968,107A). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 11 and 18.

Applicants contend that the rejection should be withdrawn in view of the previous amendments to the claims and the remarks that follow.

Applicants note that the distinction in scope between Martin and the presented invention as claimed has been shown above.

Applicants contend that the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness. The references cited, Martin and Vogan, have been placed in different classes, the only similarity being that both describe engines. Since the examiner has not shown any disclosure or suggestion in Martin that would motivate a person of ordinary skill to look to and combine the disclosure of Vogan with Martin, the only possible motivation is the Applicants' own disclosure.

Vogan measures only overall engine parameters, and looks for operating peculiarities in the overall operation of the engine to predict failure of the engine. Though Vogan does refer to replacing "pieces" of the engine (column 1, lines 18-27), he does not record, store, update or retrieve information regarding the individual parts that are comprised on a component of the internal combustion engine. Rather, he records overall engine operating information (column 2, lines 29-38) and projects engine performance based on it. In column 2, lines 39-56, he describes

S.N. 10/604,870
Office Action 08/26/05
Amendment Dated 11/28/05

a method for engine parameter trending. In neither case does he teach or suggest monitoring individual engine parts or recording, storing, updating and retrieving operating, maintenance and repair information relating to the individual parts that comprise the engine. Vogan does not use information gathered regarding individual parts of the engine to project the future maintenance requirements of their engines or even component level performance of their engines.

Even if, only for the sake of argument, the disclosures of Martin or Vogan were to be combined, the combined reference would not disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed, related to an apparatus for recording, storing, updating or retrieving operating, maintenance, and repair information for individual parts of an engine component on an information storage device and deploying the storage device on the engine component.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal allowance of the rejection.

C. Conclusion

Applicants believed that the above represents a complete response to the Examiner's rejections and places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request entry of the claim amendments and reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-29 as amended.

Applicants would appreciate a phone call should the Examiner have questions or comments with respect to this response.

Respectfully submitted,

For: Joshi et al.

By:



Daniel F. Nesbitt
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,746
(513) 229-0383
Customer Number 38155

November 28, 2005